The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., JULY 7, 1904. NO. 27.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL REFORM IN BELGIUM.

THE *Visitor*, the Catholic paper of the Providence Diocese, and the *Northwestern Chronicle*, the St. Paul diocesan organ, are entitled to a medal each: the former for the wonderful knowledge which it lately displayed in an article treating of "Christian Democracy" in Europe, and the latter for coming to the assistance of the *Visitor* in diffusing that knowledge.

Passing over much matter in the article that would all read better in a Protestant than in a Catholic periodical, we beg to quote those lines which especially concern the progressive little country whose hospitality the writer is just now enjoying:

"We are bound to aver that the Catholic Conservatives (in Belgium) have done next to nothing, in the way of social legislation, towards the betterment of the laborers' condition. They have been all-powerful in both houses now for fully twenty years, and, while their personal and charitable deeds are deserving of sincere consideration, they have enacted but a very few laws for alleviating the lot both of the lower middle-class and what is called the proletariat."

Now, if we had read these lines in any other but a Catholic paper, we should have said: The scribe who penned them is either an ignoramus or a bigot; for what the Belgian Catholics, as a political party at the head of the government for the last twenty years, have done for the laboring classes, so far surpasses anything done anywhere else in Europe or America, that only a man who gets his cue from the editorials of the Socialist and Masonic press, or one who is imbued with the spirit of the worst enemies of all that is Catholic, could come out with such a bold-faced falsehood. What then are we to think of a Catholic writer, in an American Catholic weekly, whose duty it is to take up the

cudgels for Catholic interests, making a statement so sweepingly condemnatory of a Catholic government, as if that government had utterly failed in its trust? What, for instance, would a Democrat think of the Democratic paper of his choice, if the party of which it is the recognized organ were assailed in it in such a way? We believe that said Democrat, if he has any backbone, and thinks anything at all of his party, would, after one or two repetitions of like flings, fling the paper to where it could no longer offend his eyes and ruffle his temper, and, no other exponent of his cherished political principles being at hand, would subscribe to a Republican journal; for it is not half so hard to be smitten by one's enemies as by one's own. What use is there in a Catholic burdening his budget with the price of a subscription to a Catholic weekly, if it takes up, and makes its own, the slurs on Catholics of the Judeo-Masonic press, instead of posting itself and refuting them. Why are people urged to subscribe to the Catholic weekly? It need not be to secure the local church news; for that is, as a rule, secured quicker in the secular daily than in the ex-professo Catholic weekly. It is the foreign and distant news of things Catholic, the comments and appreciations on Church matters with which the American dailies regularly regale their unsophisticated readers, that must be set aright by the Catholic weekly. It is in correcting the false impression the newspaper devotees too often glean from the dailies, that it has one of its chief *raisons d'être.* If it only partially accomplishes that duty, why, there is no need for having it; for the daily has also its days when it gives articles favorable to the Church. Its editors are capable men, well posted, and as such, unless conspicuously hostile, they know better than to make statements disparaging to Catholics and not born out by facts, such statements, for instance, as the one made by the Providence *Visitor* and reproduced by the *Northwestern Chronicle.*

"The Belgian Conservatives have done next to nothing in the way of social legislation towards the betterment of the laborers' condition!" Forsooth! We have before us a list of forty-five laws in favor of the laboring classes, enacted by the Catholic government during the twenty years of its power. Computed in cash, the advantages of these laws for the working people represent an outlay of ninety million francs per annum, and that, we beg to remark, in a country not by a thousand square miles the size of Maryland. Of these ninety million francs, the State spends fifteen million yearly in pensions for aged workingmen and fourteen millions in remunerating workingmen's sons whom conscription calls to the army. The national treasury is yearly the loser of thirteen millions because of the special, ridiculously low rates accorded to workingmen going to and coming from

their work. These rates granted to workingmen only are on the basis of a descending, scale ranging from one-third of a cent per mile for distances under three miles, to one-twelfth of a cent for distances of sixty miles and over. Moreover, thanks to the aid furnished by the State and to the prosperity of the country under the clerical administration, thirty thousand families of laboring men have become the owners of their homes during these twenty years; and these homes, as well as the homes of all the working people, are exempt from any and every house tax. The deposits in the post-office saving-banks have increased from 178,356,733 francs in 1885 to 760 millions in 1904. This amount is divided between nearly 2,000,000 depositors—a proof that it is the money of the poorer people; for it gives one P. O. bank-book for every four inhabitants.

We might go on aligning columns of statistics to show what the government of the *curés* has done for the most interesting and most numerous class of its citizens—the common people. However, we hardly think that there is need of saying more. Nevertheless, me might add two facts that were lately brought to our notice. One of these goes to show that if the clerical government has done "next to nothing to alleviate the lot both of the lower middle class and of what is called the proletariat," these classes seem to be singularly adverse to escape—notwithstanding a density of population greater than that of any country in Europe—from under the sway of a government so outrageously indifferent to their wants; for of the 178,350 emigrants who embarked on the Antwerp boats for the United States last year, less than three per cent. were Belgians. Of the ninety-seven per cent., the vast majority were Germans and Poles. The other fact is that Mr. Carnegie said of this little country: "Belgium, considering its size, is the most wonderful of industrial countries. The extent of its commerce is something astounding. Its imports and exports per capita are far ahead of those of England: its exports are twice as large and its imports still larger." Would this be the case if the government had done next to nothing during the course of these twenty years for the immense majority of its people? We think not; at least not in a country with 544 people to the square mile and with no extraordinary natural resources. Mr. Carnegie was evidently better posted on Belgian conditions than the writer in the Providence *Visitor*, who would do well to put into practice what he no doubt preaches to his readers, to look for Catholic news in Catholic papers, and, incidentally, for Belgian Catholic news in Belgian Catholic papers. To make up for lost time and opportunity, he might read with profit the latest edition of Father Vermeersch's work, 'La Législation et les Oeuvres en Belgique.'

LOUVAIN, BELGIUM. (Rev.) J. VAN DER HEYDEN.

THE ROMAN PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN: PRACTICAL ASPECT OF THE QUESTION.

We have heard so much of late in favor of what is called the Roman pronunciation of Latin, that some of us have probably begun to doubt the advisability of retaining the old system, a system which, with little differences peculiar to race and country, is, and for many centuries has been, the accepted ecclesiastical pronunciation throughout the Catholic Church. That the claims of the Roman pronunciation are deserving of consideration, I have no intention of denying. Indeed, I am convinced that its advocates have been quite successful in their efforts to reconstruct in a general way the sounds of vowels and consonants as pronounced by the Romans of the latter days of the Republic and the early Empire. But granting all this, does it follow that it would be a good thing for us to adopt it? The question is not whether Cicero's way of pronouncing Latin was better than ours, but whether under present circumstances it is practical and desirable to change our way for his. Such a change has already been effected in our State universities and in most high-schools. Catholic colleges have, however, as far as I am aware, clung to the old system with a tenacity characteristic of Catholic conservatism. And in my opinion they have acted wisely.

The apparent reason why the colleges and universities of the country showed themselves so ready to adopt the new method, was the lack of uniformity in the pronunciation of Latin prevailing throughout the United States. Certainly, the inconvenience of having no national system, as the English and Germans and Italians have, had something to do with the rapid spread of the new method amongst us. This inconvenience, however, is scarcely felt among Catholics.

Little differences are observable, but they are not such as likely to induce us to bring about a radical change of method, especially if the inconveniences connected with the new system are greater than those that have place in the old.

Moreover, in the Catholic Church, Latin can not well be called a dead language. It is dead in the sense that it is not the everyday speech of any one people, but it is very much alive as the official language of the Church, and as such is not only used throughout her liturgy, but is even now written with considerable elegance of style and spoken too in her schools of philosophy and theology. To break the continuity of this method of pronunciation, which has back of it some 1500 years, by a return to the system of cultivated Rome, requires a more substantial benefit than that of harmony of sound, or the pleasure of knowing that we are

coming closer to the pronunciation of Cicero and Livy. No one thinks of introducing in English the pronunciation of the age of Shakespeare, much as one may be devoted to the study of Shakespearean literature: and why should we adopt the Roman method of pronouncing Latin, unless some other benefit is held out to us than that of knowing that the system is an approximation to the sounds of the classical period.

Its advocates claim that "it is more musical and harmonious in sound and that it makes the structure of Latin verse clear even to to the beginner." Yes, theoretically the Roman method may be the best, and if it could be reinstated with half the perfection with which its theory has been set forth in books, there might be some justification for the assertion. But what is the practical result obtained by those who have put the method to the test? Professor Bennett,*) who says of himself that fifteen years ago his zeal for the Roman pronunciation was unbounded, and that for years he "cherished the hope that with time and better teaching a decided improvement in the results yielded by the Roman pronunciation would manifest itself," now confesses (ib. p. 75) that "the difficulties are really so great that anything like an accurate pronunciation of Latin under the Roman system is practically impossible except by the sacrifice of an amount of time out of all proportion to the importance of the end to be attained. As a matter of fact, few teachers and practically no pupils ever do acquire a pronunciation of any exactness." No doubt this very imperfect acquaintance with the new method accounts for the fact that the reading of Latin poetry as actually practised according to the Roman method often impressed me as so thoroughly unrythmical, that I could never bring myself to consider such pronunciation even a distant approximation to the way in which Horace and Virgil must have recited their poems.

There is no need of discussing the difficulties that stand in the way of acquiring a fairly perfect pronunciation based on the principles of the Roman method. The vast array of words whose vowel quantities, hidden and otherwise, the student must familiarize himself with, the very nature of quantitive reading that seems so awkward to the beginner and makes large demands on his time and attention, constitute probably the most difficult and trying part of the work,—trying to pupil and teacher alike. These together with other serious inconveniences, inherent in the system, have proved such obstacles in the path of teacher and student, that Professor Bennett gives it as the result of his personal observation, that "those who pronounce Latin with accuracy accord-

*) The Teaching of Latin and Greek. Bennett and Bristol, p. 79.

ing to the Roman method are so few as to constitute practically a negligible quantity." And he declares very frankly that, in his opinion, "the introduction of the Roman pronunciation was a fundamental blunder and that its retention is a serious mistake."

There are those who fancy that, if Latin poetry were read according to the newly revived method, we should again be in possession of the melody and rhythm with which Cicero spoke and Horace sang.

Even supposing that accuracy in reading according to the new system were within reach of the majority of pupils, instead of the few that "constitute practically a negligible quantity," I believe that there is a serious mistake underlying such an opinion. Melody and rythm are not the result merely of measured combination of long and short syllables: they are the product of so many factors, the cumulative effect of qualities so subtle of analysis and so difficult of acquisition,—tone and quality of voice, delicate shading, easy and graceful modulation, stress increasing, sustained and vanishing,—that I can easily imagine a student reading with formal correctness, whose manner would yet be totally devoid of the rhythm and movement characteristic of the Latin of the Augustan age. And why? For the simple reason that with Latin many of the factors contributing to the production of rhythmical reading and speaking are completely unknown to us. Suppose that English as a spoken language were to die out all over the world for several centuries, and that after this lapse of years a new people with a new language, altogether different from ours, were to set about reconstructing the present pronunciation from the written records of grammars and dictionaries and other sources at their command, they might succeed indeed in restoring the spoken idiom in its bare essentials, they might pronounce the vowels and consonants so as to approach with more or less accuracy the sounds as uttered to-day, but more than this, it seems to me, they would not, could not, get from the dead letter of written rules. The music and rhythm, the flow and cadence and harmony of the spoken language, must be learnt from the lips of teacher and speaker. Interrupt the living tradition of the spoken word and all other sources of information and help at once become inadequate.

And so it is with Latin. The old Latin grammarians have left us, it is true, minute directions how to shape the mouth, how to hold the tongue, and how to manage the rest of the vocal organs in the pronunciation of the several letters of the alphabet; orators and teachers of rhetoric have put down practical hints here and there. All such helps are not to be cast aside lightly or made little of: they may even be sufficient for recon-

structing a skeleton pronunciation in imitation of the live organic system that once had flesh and blood. But as a living organism can proceed only from a living being, so the genuine ring of the spoken word can be caught only from the speaker's lips. The music and melody of Latin poetry, that charmed and delighted fastidious Roman audiences at the opening of our era, must be learnt from an instructor who himself has heard the strains and felt the value of every sound and movement. In certain matters, books are sorry substitutes for the living voice of the teacher. Imagine a young man learning English pronunciation solely from written directions, or with the help of a teacher who himself had no other guide but books,—imagine such a one reciting the most rhythmical passages of Newman's prose or Tennyson's poems. Intelligible it might be, but musical and rhythmical with the music and the rhythm of present-day English, it could not be.

The book can not take the place of the teacher. And for this reason has it become impossible for us to read Latin with that melody and rhythm with which it was read in the golden age of Roman literature. While this is true, it is no less true that the teacher who is in sympathetic touch with his subject and has an ear for the musical flow of words in the vernacular, will not fail to read Latin in a manner pleasing to the ear. And though he must keep in mind that Latin is not a strongly accented language, he will succeed better, I believe, by following the old continental pronunciation than by venturing upon a method, which whatever its theoretical claims, too often results in a stiff, mechanical way of reading, and destroys that very harmony of sound, that ease and flexibility of tone, which are put forth as one of its chief claims to recognition. Whatever system is followed, it is futile to think that, by an accurate observance of syllabic and vowel quantities, we shall be able to reproduce the melody of speech that was one of the great charms of recitation for cultivated Romans.

To sum up these few remarks, the lack of any substantial benefit to be gained from the new method, the uncertain character of a pronunciation learnt from books, and the very great difficulties encountered in its acquisition, have always seemed to me effective arguments against the adoption of the Roman pronunciation. I strongly suspect that the next quarter of a century will be marked by a tendency to return to the continental system. And the schools of Europe, which so far have resisted all change of method, may have a quiet laugh over our progressive methods once more turning back to the starting point.

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY, MATTHEW GERMING, S. J.
OMAHA, NEB.

FREEMASONRY AND CATHOLIC ASCETICISM.

Would you like to see another Catholic subject treated by a Freemason? Dr. Mackey, in his 'Masonic Symbolism,' has occasion, or takes occasion, to give us his ideas of Catholic asceticism. Treating of the "Symbolism of Labor," he says:

"There was a saying of the monks of old, which is well worth meditation. They taught that 'laborare est orare'—labor is worship. They did not, it is true, always practice the wise precept. They did not always make labor a part of their religion. Like Onuphrius who lived three score years and ten in the desert, without human voice or human sympathy to cheer him, because he had not learned that man was made for man, those old ascetics went into the wilderness, and built cells and occupied themselves in solitary meditation and profitless thought. They prayed much but they did no work. And thus they passed their lives giving no pity, aid, or consolation to their fellow men, adding no mite to the treasury of human knowledge, and leaving the world when their selfish pilgrimage was finished, without a single contribution, in labor of mind or body, to its welfare. And men, seeing the uselessness of these ascetic lives, shrink now from their example and fall back upon that wiser teaching, that he best does God's will who best does God's work. The world now knows that heaven is not served by man's idleness—that the *dolce far niente*, though it might suit an Italian lazzarone, is not fit for a brave Christian man, and that they who would do rightly, and act well their part, must take this distich for their motto:—'With this hand work and with the other pray. And God will bless them both from day to day.' Now, this doctrine, that labor is worship, is the very doctrine that has been advanced and maintained from time immemorial, as a leading dogma of the Order of Freemasonry. There is no other human institution under the sun which has set forth this great principle in such bold relief. We hear constantly of Freemasonry as an institution that inculcates morality, that fosters the social feeling, that teaches brotherly love; and all this is well because it is true; but we must never forget that from its foundation-stone to its pinnacle all over its vast temple, is inscribed in symbols of living light, the great truth that labor is worship."

In a subjoined note we find the following from Aristotle: "He that can not contract society with others, or who through his own self-sufficiency (αὐτάρκειαν) does not need it, forms no part of the community and is either a wild beast or a god."

The text is taken from the 'Politics' of the famous philosopher, and like many another passage, taken apart from the context,

falsely expresses the mind of the author. The impression obviously sought to be created in the mind of the reader is: "The Catholic solitary is either a wild beast or a God: he is evidently not a God; therefore he is a wild beast; at least such would he be considered by the great Aristotle." Now, of a fact, Aristotle never treated the condition of a Catholic solitary, for such a condition did not exist in his time. It is a product of the Christian dispensation, and this, as is natural, was beyond the view of the pagan sage. He is speaking of the mere natural condition of man and conceives in such a condition but two cases possible in which a man would separate himself from society. The one is the case of forced exile; the other is that of voluntary exile, but the exile of one who hates society and seeks solitude as a bird of prey the crags or a wild beast the jungle.

"From what has preceded," he says in the same chapter from which the citation of our author is made, "it follows that society is of nature, and that man is naturally a social animal; so that he who by nature and not by fortune, is separated from society, is either more than man or a perverse man, as was he berated by Homer (Iliad, ix.) as 'without brotherhood, without law, and without hearth': for one can not be such without at the same time loving war as the solitary beast of prey among the rock." (Politics, c. i.)

"Nature destines man for society," he says. "Nature, therefore, can not cut a man off from society unless the fault be his. Now this fault can not be other than perversity of human nature, as in the misanthrope who seeks solitude to prey upon others, as the bird seeks the crag or the beast the jungle." But this is when nature cuts a man off and not when misfortune does so. In this latter case, man is not a wild beast. He injures nobody, loves his fellow-man, is willing at any time to give what assistance he may to such as, lost in the forest, have claims upon his help—there is nothing of the wild beast in this. Not therefore every solitary is, according to Aristotle, ἢ θερίον ἢ θεός, either a wild beast or a god, but every one who is cut off from society by nature. God, in virtue of His nature, is superior to every social need; the misanthrope, by infidelity to nature, sinks beneath the social level: they whom fortune has cut off, form a class apart. To this class the Christian solitary belongs. Of nature, therefore, in ordinary normal conditions, is he speaking when he says: "If each one when separated from society is not self-sufficient (αὐτάρκης), he will bear the same relation to society that other parts bear to the whole to which they belong: but he who can not live in companionship with others (ὁ δὲ μὴ δυνάμενος κοινωνεῖν) or who on account of

self-sufficiency stands in need of nothing, is not a part of society, and hence is either a wild beast or a god."

His position is perfectly plain. Under ordinary conditions, in the purely natural order, no one is self-sufficient, but each needs the aid of his fellow-man. If he is not self-sufficient, he will naturally form part of the whole which is to impart that sufficiency; hence under ordinary conditions man will be found living in society. This is all that Aristotle holds and what everybody may hold. But it in no way assails the Catholic solitary. He indeed dwells at a distance from human habitations, but he is ever joined in good will to his fellow-men. His wants are few and easily supplied by the natural products of the forests. His self-sufficiency is not one of pride or arrogance or contempt of others, but one of self-abnegation and sacrifice, which often leaves to others a greater measure of enjoyment because undivided with them. His brotherhood is still the brotherhood of man; his law is the natural law as well as the revealed law of Christian love; what is there of the wild beast in this? His self-sufficiency is at most a material one, because nature herself supplies all his material wants; in a religious sense he is never self-sufficient, but ever participates and longs to participate in all the spiritual benefits which flow from the Catholic Church, of which he is ever an active member. He is not indeed God, though he is more than the ordinary man; for he is more master of himself than the common run of mortals, and this is a perfection. If he avoids intercourse with men, it is not that he hates them, but that he may be freer to hold intercourse with God.

BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

The Young Priest. Conferences on the Apostolic Life. By Herbert, Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster. Edited by his Brother, Msgr. Canon John S. Vaughan. London, Burnes & Oates; St. Louis, B. Herder. Price $2 net.

This little volume, which is ornamented with its author's likeness, contains a series of reflections penned by him when he lay stricken with disease and was unable to preach, ordain, confirm, or superintend the affairs of his diocese. His object in composing it was to offer useful suggestions, not to seminarians and elderly clergymen, but to the young priest passing through that anxious and vital period of transition that begins with ordination and continues during a somewhat undefined and uncertain period, that is, until the mind and character have taken their permanent bend

and direction. Needless to say, these suggestions are admirably adapted to their purpose. We know of no better or more useful book that could be presented to a newly ordained priest upon the day of his first mass, than these conferences of the learned, pious, and experienced Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster, now resting in the peace of his Master, whom he served so well.

In a second edition we should like to see the numerous misprints that disfigure the Latin citations, eliminated.

——On March 24th (No. 12, p. 185—6) we said in a review of 'The Two Kenricks' by John J. O'Shea:

"Archbishop Ryan in his brief introduction tells us that it was once his ambition to be the biographer of the Kenricks, whom he rightly styles 'two great ecclesiastics.' It can not be too deeply regretted that, being unable to accomplish a task for which he was well fitted, Msgr. Ryan delegated it to a newspaper hack so utterly incompetent as the author of the present volume, which, honesty compels us to say, is a distinct and unmitigated failure from any and every coign of vantage from which we may choose to view it. Rude in the disposition of material, unscholarly in treatment, slovenly in style, and careless in typographical make-up, it is a full-fledged specimen of what such a book should not be."

It may interest those who thought this criticism too severe, to know that our foremost authority on American Catholic history, Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin, not only agrees with us but even goes a step farther and charges Mr. O'Shea with wilful prevarication. We quote two passages of his review (*American Catholic Historical Researches*, xxi, 3):

"The work is of little historical value. It is a made to order piece of work, a job lot of whitewash and flummery and wholly unworthy of the two Kenricks. But having written it at appointment of Archbishop Ryan, who examined the manuscript, it must of course be regarded as a great work. If it is the best that can be said of the two Kenricks it is not much to boast of. The work would have no standing whatever but for Archbishop Ryan's connection therewith and his approval of it as meritorious."

"The account (of the historical fight between Bishop Egan and the trustees of St. Mary's, Pha.), given in 'The Two Kenricks' is wholly untrue. All the facts in the case were easily accessible to Mr. O'Shea. There are signs that he did examine. Yet the facts are perverted in order to be in accord with a method on which Catholic history is usually related."

MINOR TOPICS.

The New Professor of History in the Catholic University of America.—When it became known that the chair of American history established by the "Knights of Columbus" in the "Catholic University of America" had been tendered to, and accepted by, Prof. Charles H. McCarthy of Philadelphia, we remarked (No. 22, p. 352): "If Professor McCarthy has any literary or scientific reputation, it has not yet reached the wild and woolly West."

That the appointment of Professor McCarthy was a grievous blunder, now appears beyond a doubt from a paper by Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin, whom we know to be an honest man and a capable historian, in the July number of his *American Catholic Historical Researches.* We quote:

"What is his fitness for the position? To the public that must be a settled matter. His selection must be considered as endowing him with the qualifications necessary to justify his election and to carry on the work it is declared the Chair to which he has been appointed has been founded 'to preserve and teach.' And yet in his known historical contributions there is no note of his possessing the *Catholic* historical spirit which the Chair is supposed to be the exponent of. He is only stated to have issued a work on Lincoln's Reconstruction. He has lectured on the Louisiana Purchase. The *Catholic University Bulletin* of April contains his review of the three volumes of Trevelyan's 'American Revolution.' This may be considered his thesis by which his appointment to the Chair was judged. Yet when he comes to the religious chapter, his review ceases—without a word of comment on 'the bearing of religious controversies on the war.'

"So in whatever is reported or known to be his work, the Catholic aspect or mind has not been manifested. His historical mind is secular and national, not religious. It runs in the line of national affairs, not in that of Catholic events. So to make the Chair accord with the intent of the Knights and of the Cardinal, he must reverse or keep more in abeyance his historical temperament and bring out more forcibly the Catholic spirit in dealing with public events in the history of our country so as to manifest more clearly the doings of the Church and her children 'in the upbuilding of the country.' So he really must begin to study what he is to teach others.

"There is not the least doubt but that he is fitted to teach American history. He has yet himself to learn that which he is expected to teach the country, for it must be recognized that whatever may emanate from his Chair must be a lesson of education to all the land.

"It is also noticeable that Prof. McCarthy has not received his education under Catholic educational direction—that his primary education was in the public schools and his collegiate education in non-Catholic institutions. So it is not to be wondered at that the trend of his mind has not been religiously inclined, and so in his writings or lectures the Catholic historical spirit has not been manifested.

"His selection best testifies to the need of a Catholic University

from which in time men may come competent to be teachers in our Catholic institutions, capable of developing the intellect along Catholic lines and awakening the Catholic spirit of our educated ones. After a long period of our educational institutions they could not turn out one capable of being chosen to this professorship.

"The lack of the very element which should at once be foremost in the occupancy of the Chair is not censurable. What he does not possess, who else does? Save Rev. Dr. Lambing, the historian of Western Pennsylvania, no one else in all America has that Catholic historical spirit or has toiled in that unrequited and cheerless field. He has spent, as he says, 'thirty almost thankless years' in working out not only Catholic but also secular history. He is the only one to whom the Chair might have been most fitly offered. He has proven his worth and work. He has the Catholic historical spirit and a mind inclined to the investigation of Catholic historical matters. He has dealt sufficiently with secular or national affairs to so unite the two needed elements necessary in the Chair as to make one wonder why the Chair was uot first offered him, especially as he is a priest and priests usually get the preference even when not so worthy, in all Catholic affairs. Perhaps he may have been.

"Next to him would have been Prof. James F. Edwards, of Notre Dame University. He is professor of history there. He has the Catholic historical spirit or temperament so fully developed that he has gathered the greatest Catholic historical collection for the University that exists in the country..... Most likely, however, neither Dr. Lambing or Prof. Edwards were even thought of. Not at all likely. Such kind are usually forgotten or ignored. They do the work and others are given the token of recognition."

The "Knights of Columbus" and Partisan Politics.—We read in the *Catholic Columbian* (No. 8): "Mr. D. I. Murphy, erstwhile editor of the *New Century*, Washington, D. C., and ardent defender of the present administration, has been appointed secretary of the Panama Canal Commission. We are somewhat disappointed. Our suspicions led us to believe Mr. Murphy was aspiring to a cabinet portfolio. At any rate, many of the matters which appeared in the editorial columns of the *New Century* are now made clear for the first time."

It is painful to note that the "greatest and most ideal Catholic organization in the country," the "Knights of Columbus," instead of attempting to stem the tide of political corruption which is gnawing at the root of American citizenship, is, according to its most zealous champions in the press, rather using its influence in the opposite direction. Says the Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen* (xxxiv, 30):

"The Knights of Columbus, according to rumor, are to be investigated by Cardinal Satolli during his.....visit to this country. This is important if true; but it is probably not true. The Knights of Columbus may safely disregard the pin-headed heresy hunter. The real danger to that organization is from within. It must guard itself against the local politician, the over-festive-do-

nothing disposition and too much ritual work. We notice as an illustration of one of these dangers that John J. Delany, present corporation counsel of the city of New York, by virtue of Tammany's success, is being severely criticized in a New York Catholic paper. Mr. Delany is a very prominent member of the Knights of Columbus, it is even said that he owes his appointment as corporation counsel to the K. of C. In appointing his assistants, it is alleged that he passed over an applicant strongly endorsed and well-qualified, who was a member of the Knights of Columbus and appointed a Republican negro instead. Our New York Catholic contemporary asks: 'Who is Delany that he should take upon himself, in disregard of the demand, in neglect of the interest, and in contempt of the traditions of the Democratic organization of New York, to instal a negro Republican in a position to which his own organization recommended and endorsed a Knight of Columbus?' We don't know. He may have done right; but, nevertheless, the incident is symptomatic of conditions that 'the greatest order that ever existed in the Catholic Church' should concern itself about."

Is it not significant, by the way, that THE REVIEW has of late been able to conduct its crusade against the "Knights of Columbus" almost entirely with weapons furnished by newspaper organs which have hitherto been the order's most strenuous champions?

A New Calendar.—A reformer in the N. Y. *Sun* proposes a new calendar. In the first place, he thinks, the year should be called Anno Veri, the year of truth, instead of Anno Domini, because all years since creation are "years of the Lord." It should begin from the time when we first discovered what caused the year, viz., the revolution of the earth around the sun. This was practically established in 1600 by Galileo. The present year, therefore, would be A. V. 304. Our months originate from the phases of the moon. There are thirteen "moonths," hence there should be thirteen months. It would be better that these months should be named numerally—Latin numerals preferred. Since, however, people are averse to changes, perhaps the simplest plan would be to add one more month. If the months retained their present names, instead of numerals, as suggested above, it would only be necessary to add another and call it Trecember, or the abbreviated thirteen. Each month should have twenty-eight days, or seven weeks, which correspond to the aspects of the moon from dark to full and back again. Each day of the month would then occur on the same day of the week throughout the entire year. Thirteen months of twenty-eight days equals 364 days. There would thus be one odd day each year and two such odd days in leap years. This day should not be counted in the calendar at all, but set aside and celebrated as New Year's day. In leap years there would be two such holidays. The first of the fiscal year should be the first Monday after the winter solstice, excepting the New Year day. This would be December 23d. In the year 1907, December 23d will occur on Monday. The day of rest should not be the first, but the last day of the week, as the Bible directs that it should be. Coming, as they do, so close together, Christmas and New Year's day could be celebrated as one.

Houtin's Book 'L'Americanisme' on the Index.—In our review of the Abbé Houtin's book on Americanism (L'Américanisme, par Albert Houtin. Paris, 1904. Emile Nourry) we said (THE REVIEW, vol. xi, No. 4, January 28th, 1904):

"All in all we can not recommend the book. Its author's methods are those of the shyster, and his purpose is to upholster a falsehood....It would not surprise us if the Sacred Congregation of the Index would inscribe 'L'Américanisme'....on the official roster of dangerous and forbidden books."

Our expectation has been realized. By decree of June 3rd, Houtin's book has been put on the Index.

The following two works have met the same fate: 'Saint François d'Assise,' by Ciro Alvi; and 'Nostra maxima Culpa. Die bedrängte Lage der kath. Kirche, etc.,' by Anton Vogrinec.

The decree also announces that Charles Denis and Michel Georgel, whose names were inscribed on the Index last December, "laudabiliter se subjecerunt."

——Most of our Catholic papers have alluded frequently to the kind of literature to be found in barber shops. It is usually of the *Police News* order. A friend of the *Sacred Heart Review*, however, tells that estimable journal (xxxi, 26) that "there are barbers, and barbers." He strayed into a shop in Charlestown the other night, and was surprised to find upon a table, together with other high-grade papers and magazines, the Boston College *Stylus*, the Holy Cross *Purple*, the *Tablet* and *American Ecclesiastical Review*—current numbers too, and all bearing evidence of having been read by many. The yellow journal and the pink police papers were conspicuously absent. "The proprietor of this shop," remarks our contemporary, "is setting an example which others of his trade might well follow."

Many would doubtless follow it if the Catholic men who patronize barber shops would do their duty by protesting against bad literature and demanding clean—and, where there are a number of Catholic customers, Catholic newspapers.

——After the recent "National Council" of the "Knights of Columbus" in Louisville, Ky., the delegates made a trip to Mammoth Cave. There, we read in several of our exchanges, "a large bronze Knights of Columbus emblem on a large iron pole was planted with a short ceremony at the entrance to the cave. Each Knight present thereupon cast a stone at the base of the staff, and hereafter every Knight passing the emblem will cast a stone at its base, until a large mound of pebbles shall have been cast as a mark of world-wide respect."

A truly worthy monument to a society of modern Catholic "knights" who see one of their chief aims in the aping of Masonic fol-de-rol!

——With all the recent flurry over reduced steerage rates, the fact is that immigration is decidedly on the ebb. The greatest on record was that of 1903, when 857,046 aliens were admitted.

The decline set in last December. In that month the total was only 28,000, against 36,000 the year before. Since then the figures have gone down steadily. The busiest months at Ellis Island are April and May. Last year in April 91,000 came in; this year 63,000. For May the corresponding figures are 92,000 and 68,000. The total immigration at New York for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1903, was 599,488; the total up to date is 479.286. For the whole country it would seem safe to predict an immigration in 1904 not exceeding 700,000.

——Commenting on a subject recently mentioned in THE REVIEW, the *New World* (xii, 43) says: "The action of the Chicago Board of Education in abolishing secret societies in the city public and high schools deserves commendation. There are altogether too many secret societies in the country already, and inoculating the minds of young people with the lodge-idea is ridiculous. It is, to put it mildly, a very poor preparation for home life. It is nauseating to contemplate the several hundred thousand glitter-and-tinsel Supreme Eminent Knight Commanders now strutting the American stage. Let our young people at least be innocent of such folly."

——A writer in the Chicago *New World* (xii, 43) shows that public (State) schools are hotbeds of Socialism. "In the public schools of our land," he says, "a godless, shiftless, ease-loving, slavish generation is springing up like mush-rooms in a dark and damp cellar.....If it were not for the influx of so many people from all the countries of Europe, who are not tainted with the air of godless public schools, and if it were not for the many private schools existing and bearing fruit in the land, there would be small hope for this country."

——According to Mr. W. E. Curtis, of the Chicago *Record-Herald* (quoted in the *New World*, xii, 43), Governor Wright in the Philippines distinctly told apostate Aglipay, a few days ago, that he must obey the law and quit seizing Catholic churches which do not belong to him.

——The unusual spectacle of a Catholic priest opening a national convention of a political (the Republican) party with prayer was witnessed at Chicago recently. We have not heard anybody say that it was an edifying spectacle.

——A Catholic teacher and organist of long experience is seeking a position. Able to teach German and English. Well versed in Gregorian Chant. Best references. Address: C. R., office of THE REVIEW.